

is something that is going on that can work in that direction, and I want to draw attention to it.

Two teachers, one Mary Catherine Bradshaw in Hillsboro High School in Nashville, and Heather Beck, a teacher at Green Mountain High School in Colorado, and also a student, Rebecca Hunter, they have created a pledge, a pledge which I will enter into the record, a pledge they ask each student to take.

It says: As a part of the blank community, I will pledge to be a part of the solution. I will eliminate taunting from my own behavior. I will encourage others to do the same. I will do my part to make my school a safe place by being more sensitive to others. I will set the example of a caring individual. I will not let my word or actions hurt others. I will become a part of the solution.

This is the real way to address it.

Mr. Speaker, I include the following for the RECORD:

Please print this out and sign this petition.
As a part of the _____ Community, I will . . .

I will pledge to be a part of the solution.
I will eliminate taunting from my own behavior.

I will encourage others to do the same.
I will do my part to make _____ a safe place by being more sensitive to others.

I will set the example of a caring individual.

I will not let my word or actions hurt others.

. . . and if others won't become a part of the solution, I will.

Signing here reflects your commitment to your pledge through graduation 1999.

GETTING A BETTER RETURN ON INVESTMENT

(Mr. SMITH of Michigan asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.)

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, just reporting to my colleagues, today at our Social Security Task Force meeting, Roger Ibbotson was one of the witnesses, and he estimated that the stock market would increase to 100,000 by the year 2025. So as we talk about the possibility of taking advantage of some of the investment money coming in in Social Security taxes and helping to solve the Social Security problem by using some of that money for private retirement investment accounts, if his estimates are a little bit high or a little bit low, and I would recall to our attention that it was Dr. Ibbotson that said in 1974 that the stock market would go from 1,000 to 10,000. Of course, that was at a time when the stock market was significantly depressed.

So as we look for real solutions to Social Security, I think it is becoming more agreed that part of the effort that we must take is getting a better return

on the investment that workers of this country pay in.

Doctor Gary Burtless also testified before our Social Security Task Force today and agreed that long-term investment rates can enhance Social Security.

Dr. Gary Burtless is a Senior Fellow in Economic Studies with the Brookings Institution. Dr. Burtless has published various articles on Social Security, Medicare and social welfare, and testified before several House and Senate committees. He has published various articles and presented testimony.

Dr. Roger Ibbotson, Professor of finance at Yale School of Management, also serves as Chairman of Ibbotson Associates, which publishes an annual Yearbook of stock, bonds, treasury bill, and inflation rates. He has been recognized as a leading expert in measuring rates of return for the past twenty years.

Our bi-partisan Social Security Task Force meets every week on Tuesday at noon. All members are welcome to attend and I will again send out a report to, colleagues on today's hearing.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BRADY of Texas). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. LIPINSKI addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. PALLONE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

DIFFICULT VOTE FOR CONGRESS ON EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, last week and probably again either Thursday of this week or early next week we will have one of the most difficult votes that a Congress can cast, and that is on our emergency supplemental.

It might be called a war-plus bill. It is not just to forward fund the war, because there are over \$3 billion to for-

ward fund the war; and it is not just monies that could escalate the war, because there are multiple categories in this bill, including money intended to rebuild our national defense that could, in fact, expand this to a ground war, and the motion to limit that was defeated.

So this, in fact, is not just a funding bill for the war, however, because it also includes important funds to rebuild what has been a devastating number of years on our military, where we do not have the readiness and where we have sent troops into battle without being properly prepared and without the munitions necessary. We have weakened ourselves around the world, and I realize that.

It also has important funds for our agricultural catastrophes, and it may even have things for Hurricane Mitch and the victims of the earthquake in Colombia in this bill. It has a pay boost for our veterans.

But, ultimately, this is a vote on war. And that becomes a very difficult subject for Members of Congress to handle in their districts because, in fact, we have troops on the ground, and none of us want to be perceived as weakening them and putting them in the battle without adequate supplies. At the same time, many of us have strong reservations about this war, that, in fact, it is not winnable and, in fact, we are putting our soldiers' lives unnecessarily at danger by continuing to fund this war.

I have been regularly visiting high schools and elementary schools in my district since the first of the year as part of the Committee on Education and the Workforce efforts to look at the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. And when I talk to students, whether about the drug-free school program or school violence, inevitably the war comes up. Because many of them are concerned that they may soon become involved in this, especially if it expands to a ground war and we should have to resort to a draft, which in fact we might have to do if we need 400,000 troops.

The question I get regularly asked, since I express my skepticism that this war cannot be successful and we have had a poor strategy, is how do we stop genocide and the ethnic cleansing around the world if in fact we do not fight this war; and what are we to do to show our disapproval if we do not go to war? These are difficult questions but not easily addressed or solved merely by saying, therefore, we are going to bomb everybody who we disagree with or who we think has committed genocide.

Clearly, this has been a problem in the past. It has happened in Turkey vis-a-vis the Armenians. We watched the Communists overrun Hungary. And many of us, I was only 6 years old at the time of the Hungarian revolution, but many Americans felt we should have intervened at that point.

But there are certain things in American history we have said that are criteria for when we get involved in these type of conflicts. One is generally that it has to cross international boundaries. This question is complicated here because it is inside a nation, albeit an autonomous subsection of that nation or at least an area we believe should be autonomous.

We have also historically argued that there has to be a clear national interest. And the only clear national interest here is the instability of Europe; and, quite frankly, what we have seen is that every week this war goes on, Europe is becoming less stable and the agreement will be less good. In other words, our peak in American interest agreement was before we started bombing. Every week the bombing has continued, the agreement in the end will be worse.

The agreements that are now on the table we could have had several weeks ago. In truth, the Kosovars are less willing and the Serbians less willing to live together in peace in the future because of the conflict escalating. The more we bomb, the more we destabilize Montenegro.

Now we have accidentally hit the Chinese embassy, and China has used this at least as an occasion to stir up their people. Russia is concerned as to whether we will be coming in there, and they have reactivated and are concerned about their nuclear defenses because they do not want us coming in if it is Chechnya.

Other nations around the world are concerned about what our international policy is. Israel is concerned, justly, that if we recognize an independent Kosovo, what does that mean for the Palestinians? Turkey is concerned about what this means for the Kurds. The settlement we are looking towards is worse than we would have had early on while there was still a possibility to put this thing back together.

Furthermore, it does not appear to be winnable. Historically, wars or efforts that have worked have been winnable or had an exit strategy. But that does not and still begs the fundamental moral question: How then do we deal with a Milosevic or a Serbian population? Or, for that matter, in Croatia, where many people were killed and moved out? The ethnic cleansing being the moved out; the killed being the genocide without a trial.

Now Sandy Berger, the National Security Adviser to our Republican conference, suggested that the goal of this administration, and he said this point-blank, was to teach the world how to live together in peace. This shows some of the divisions that we have in this country and in the world regarding, quite frankly, the perfectibility of man. Can we, in fact, especially through bombs, teach the world how to live in peace? Or even without bombs, is that a realistic goal?

In my opinion, that is more a humanist perfectibility of man argument and

not one rooted in the Judeo-Christian beliefs that this country was founded on.

Mr. Speaker, I will extend my comments with written remarks, because I am very concerned the premises of this war are unachievable and the goals are false and, therefore, because of a kind heart, we have plunged ourselves in an unwinnable conflict that is contrary to our own moral traditions.

TRANSPORTATION AND COMMUNITY SYSTEMS PRESERVATION PROGRAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. BLUMENAUER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, this last week at the Conference on Sustainable Development in Detroit, Michigan, the administration announced the winners of the Transportation and Community Systems Preservation Program. The TCSP was a little noticed title in TEA-21, which really did not get the attention and recognition it deserved.

□ 1845

There are a number of programs that spend far more than the \$13 million involved, but there are few that will have more long-term impact.

The program had its origin in the experience in my State of Oregon in the early 1990s, where citizen activists successfully petitioned the State Department of Transportation to consider an alternative to a traditional beltway that included careful land use planning, connecting the transportation links, and grouping uses in a way that might be able to achieve the transportation and congestion and air quality objectives without as much concrete. And the fact is that the alternative that they developed was more cost effective than simply building a traditional road.

This LUTRAC program, helping communities design local initiatives to maximize their infrastructure investment, has found its way into ISTEA.

Yesterday morning, I visited with Federal, State and local officials and local business people in my community dealing with FEMA's Project Impact. And here we found that Oregon's requirement of careful land use planning with local governments actually has made a significant impact in lowering the losses to flood damage. It has resulted in saving Oregon's homeowners and businesses millions of dollars as a result of disaster mitigation.

The TCSP is designed to extend these principles beyond natural disasters to potential manmade disasters of needless loss of farmland, forests, unnecessary traffic congestion, and conflicts between residential, commercial, and industrial uses.

Recently we had a presentation from the director of our State watchdog

agency, the Land Conservation and Development Commission, which was set up to enforce and regulate the land use requirements that our Oregon voters have repeatedly supported. He presented the data that I found rather compelling that, in the 20 years that we have had our system, we actually protected an increase of 4 percent more agriculture land in the Willamette Valley in Oregon.

The metropolitan Portland area, although it has increased in population 42 percent, the urbanized area has only increased 20 percent. Unlike what has happened in New York City, where the urbanized area increased eight times more rapidly than the population increase, in Chicago it was 11 times more rapidly urbanization in the population increase, Detroit 13 times.

An even more interesting comparison is we have two fast growing counties in the Portland metropolitan area, one, Washington County, just to the west of the City of Portland, and one to the north in the State of Washington, Clark County. Both have been the fastest growing counties in their States.

Clark County, in Washington, lost 6,000 more acres of farmland than Washington County, even though in Washington County we have increased more than 40,000 more residents than Clark County. Not only that, but the per-farm income actually dropped by 10 percent in Clark County, while in Washington County, with the land use and transportation protections, farm income rose by 30 percent, farm income rising in a county that is the home of Oregon's high-tech industry.

The TCSP program is going to make a difference in localities that do not have the Oregon land use planning framework and it is going to make a huge difference in our community building on that system.

There have been over 500 applications submitted around the country. This week, in Denver, there are people studying at a conference right now how to use the program.

I strongly urge that each Member of Congress look at the applications from their district, understand how they work. These concepts of smart growth can include a number of programs that simply are not going to be funded without having the adequate support from our Congressional representatives. It will in the long run save far more tax dollars than the modest investment in planning; and, most important, it will include our citizens in helping shape impacts on their destiny.

WHITE HOUSE YOUTH VIOLENCE SUMMIT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BRADY of Texas). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I have taken out this time to make some comments about the horrendous tragedy